

ARIZONA PUBLIC SAFETY COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Summary of Minutes

August 21, 2007

Voting Members Present:

David Felix, Deputy Director, Arizona Department of Public Safety (Chairman)
Ray Allen, Assistant Chief, Tucson Fire Department
Marcus Aurelius, Emergency Management
Amy Brooks, Captain, Apache Junction Fire Department
Hal Collett, Sheriff, La Paz County/Arizona Sheriff's Association
Jan Hauk, Past President, Arizona Fire District Association Representative
Tracy Montgomery, Assistant Chief, Phoenix Police Department
Leesa Morrison, Director, Arizona Department of Homeland Security
Dan Wills, Battalion Chief, Sedona Fire District

Voting Members Absent:

Richard Miranda, Chief, Tucson Police Department
Dora Schriro, Director, Arizona Department of Corrections
Danny Sharp, Chief, Oro Valley Police Department
Dewayne Woodie, Fire Chief, Ganado Fire District/EMS
Mike Worrell, Captain, Phoenix Fire Department

PSCC Support Office Attendees:

Curt Knight, Executive Director, Public Safety Communications Commission
Jeff Miner, Project Manager, Public Safety Communications Commission
Renee Larson, Administrative Services Officer, Public Safety Communications Commission
Evelyn Jablonski, Executive Assistant, Public Safety Communications Commission

Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 1:10 p.m. by Chairman David Felix. Roll call was taken by Ms. Evelyn Jablonski as noted above and a quorum was declared present.

Approval of Minutes from July 10, 2007

Chairman Felix inquired if commissioners had an opportunity to review the July 10, 2007 minutes included in the commissioner's meeting packet. No comments were received. He advised approval of minutes could be done at the next meeting and requested a motion to table the approval of the July 10 draft minutes until then. Commissioner Dan Wills presented the first motion; Commissioner Ray Allen seconded. Motion carried unanimously to table the July 10, 2007 draft minutes until the next meeting.

Ms. Jablonski made a request for commissioners to identify themselves when speaking and specifically when making a motion. Chairman Felix stated due to more frequent meetings the use of a transcription service would be utilized to hopefully turn the minutes around in a faster time frame. In terms of using this service, he requested commissioners to identify themselves for that purpose. Ms. Jablonski expressed her thanks to the commissioners.

Arizona Regional Advisory Council (RAC) Meetings

Mr. Knight reported he attended five different Regional Advisory Council (RAC) meetings to address the federal Fiscal Year 2007 grant requests for interoperable communications. Grant applicants expressed concern at these meetings of being unaware of the rules and of an additional review for interoperability grant applications. A second review was requested of those applications in addition to some grant applications that were categorized incorrectly which will be addressed later this week.

Mr. Knight thanked Commissioner Leesa Morrison for the opportunity to help with the review process of focusing the funds for future use. No questions or comments arose.

Statewide Communications Interoperability Plan (SCIP)/Public Safety Interoperable Communications (PSIC) News and Updates

Grant Awards Announced

Mr. Knight reported the dollar amounts awarded for the Public Safety Interoperable Communications (PSIC) grant have been publicized for all states/jurisdictions. A handout was provided to the commissioners showing the funding allocations for all states with \$17.7 million allocated to Arizona. Mr. Knight stated it was his understanding portions of that would become available to the state by the September 30, 2007 date with the remainder available around the March/April 2008 timeframe.

Discussion was held on how funding allocations per state were determined. Mr. Knight felt it was a risk-based formula and suggested feedback from Commissioner Morrison. Commissioner Morrison's understanding was it was a "threat-risk vulnerability assessment" with population built into the formula.

Mr. Knight informed the Commission of additional federal legislation signed by the President in an attempt to make this into a five-year continuing process for the purpose of distributing a large amount of Homeland Security monies specifically in the area of interoperable communications. He advised there is an indication by the House and Senate that \$3.8 billion is the figure being advertised to be spread out over the next five fiscal years to accomplish the same purpose of the PSIC grant. It is unknown at this time if those additional monies have or will be funded.

Critical Dates

Mr. Knight advised of the recent critical date change reference the Statewide Communications Interoperable Plan (SCIP). He reported initially the final SCIP, grant application and investment justifications would have been due on November 1, 2007; however, the date recently changed to December 3, 2007.

Other critical dates which remain unchanged are the September 1 draft review by the Interoperable Communications Technical Assistance Program (ICTAP) and September 30 for the draft review by the federal Department of Homeland Security.

Contract Support

Mr. Knight reported since the July 2007 meeting the Government Information Technology Agency (GITA), the Arizona Department of Homeland Security (AZDOHS) and PSCC pulled together to form a subcommittee of individuals to help advance the statewide Plan, grant request, investment justifications and state procurement issues of hiring a grant writer.

Ms. Lisa Meyerson, statewide Project Manager, GITA, reported this project is being done as a team effort at the direction of the Governor's Chief of Staff and takes highest priority for the Governor's Office. She advised the grant writing services for the SCIP, PSIC grant application request and investment justifications are being done by Federal Engineering (FE) and Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC) in collaboration with the lead contractor, Data Site Consortium contracted by the state. The SAIC's role will be to provide two reviews: the first would be a very detailed comment and review, and the second review would be a more general, commented overview.

Current Status of Plan/Grant and Investment Justifications

Ms. Meyerson reported a series of meetings and discussions have taken place since the July PSCC meeting between the subcommittee of state and contract individuals and based on those meetings an executive summary and timeline was created as a review of what has transpired and what is still to take place in terms of tying those activities into the statewide Plan. Ms. Meyerson requested the Commission's review and comments on the Executive Summary which Mr. Knight stated it would be sent out electronically tomorrow morning with the following documents: draft minutes of July 10, 2007 meeting and Timeline and Status document. Comments on the Executive Summary are requested back to the PSCC Support Office a week from tomorrow (August 29).

In the Executive Summary, Ms. Meyerson gave a breakdown of the five investment justifications to be included in the SCIP. She advised of the importance of the Commission and the locals being in agreement that these were the categories we were interested in funding based on the \$17.7 million allocated to Arizona. She reported the locals would have the opportunity through the Arizona Department of Homeland Security's grant application process to make their needs known. The fifth category was recently added and is required per specific guidance to set aside additional dollars for disaster emergency support as per federal Department of Homeland Security.

Commissioner Morrison expressed her appreciation and thanks to all the state agencies and contract individuals who have been involved in seeing this project progress from the last 30 days. Mr. Knight also recognized Ms. Cheryl Bowen from Commissioner Morrison's office for the help she has provided.

Commissioner Marcus Aurelius reported as a point of reference the state of Arizona will be engaged in TOPOFF4 between the dates of October 15-24, 2007. He expressed concern for the challenges that might be imposed upon in terms of the TOPOFF performance dates versus the timeline document dates and the people involved with the SCIP and TOPOFF. Ms. Meyerson stated they have given themselves a 30-day window with room to move and adjust dates accordingly based on contingent guidance. No further discussion took place.

Demonstration Project Status

Review

Mr. Knight gave a brief history of the last couple of meetings dating back to April 24 through July 10 and how those events shaped where we are today. Based on those decisions, we are now at a point of wanting to take advantage of expanding coverage with those existing systems (City of Phoenix and Yuma) for our demonstration project. Those two elements are the core of the demonstration project. He stated the following four of the five bullet points presented at the July 10, 2007 PSCC meeting are those being worked on today for our demonstration project:

- Add 700 MHz trunked system coverage at White Tanks.
- Add 700 MHz trunked system coverage at Oatman Mountain.
- Add an Inter System Interface between Yuma Regional Communications System (YRCS) and City of Phoenix/Mesa (PRWN/TOPAZ).
- Add 700 MHz radio capability to state agency vehicles working within the expanded coverage area of PRWN/TOPAZ and YRCS.

Schedule

The time presented pointed out that the infrastructure portions of the Demonstration Project, White Tanks, Oatman Mountain, and the Inter System Interface between Yuma and Phoenix, would not be constructed in time for the Super Bowl. However, some 800 MHz subscriber radios are planned to be available to DPS officers in time for Super Bowl.

Budget Summary

After the July 10 PSCC meeting, it was requested budget figures be re-worked to provide more detail on the major components of the demonstration project. Mr. Knight presented those budget figures to the Commission with a breakdown in the following categories: microwave/fiber, trunk site equipment, ISI/console interfaces, mobile/portable radios (each shown separately) and training and then a further breakdown by locations (five). (See Appendix A for demonstration project budget breakdown.) Mr. Knight stated the figures were conservative and felt they would be lower than shown on the slide based on the equipment manufacturer not providing 100 percent of the installation labor and facility configuration/modernization.

Mr. Knight stated an element still being worked out with Department of Public Safety's Wireless Systems Bureau (DPS WSB) was deciding what areas would require modernization and upgrades to their facilities and how/if that would be handled by WSB, specifically the White Tanks and Oatman Mountain locations which might impact the cost. Another cost element which is unknown is the ISI interface being that this component is still relatively new and proprietary in nature. The third element where the PSCC might be able to reduce the cost was for portable radios. He stated these were the three areas he felt where the figures might be lower than stated. The total cost as indicated on the slide is PSCC's safe budget figure.

Chairman Felix questioned if the trunk site equipment on White Tanks and Oatman would involve any building expansion or if the capacity was already there. Mr. Knight reported both these sites are DPS owned, managed and operated for state use. He stated White Tanks is limited in capacity but it has been determined that equipment can be consolidated within this facility to allow required space for the trunked system. He reported the reason the cost was high

for both the White Tanks and Oatman Mountain sites were due essentially to an expanded battery string for emergency back-up power. This battery string is not a regular piece of equipment that is part of the DPS Telecommunications Center and so the \$685,000 for White Tanks and \$525,000 for Oatman Mountain costs may be reduced with those elements still being negotiated should the DPS WSB perform some of the work associated with this equipment. The battery string element at Oatman Mountain is the same situation as White Tanks.

Chairman Felix inquired if the ISI interface technology was a proven concept or still in the pilot test phase. His understanding from the Flagstaff meeting was the ISI was still a new technology under development. Mr. Knight's understanding was the hardware was not new; however, the software which interfaces system A (Phoenix) to system B (Yuma) was new. Chairman Felix stated he was unsure if he followed this new technology. Mr. Knight stated the vision of this was to provide an overlap in coverage between the two systems, "a seamless approach." He stated our intent is to leverage this into a permanent solution that is an Inter Subsystem Interface (ISSI) or standards-based interface.

Per the slide on the demonstration project budget, Chairman Felix inquired who the training was targeted for and what was to be accomplished by this training. Mr. Knight advised the training would be for the Yuma Regional personnel, ISI training for Phoenix and Yuma, and technicians from the Department of Public Safety would also be receiving training for their role as the major provider of system restoration for the White Tanks and Oatman sites from the basics to high-end level training. He indicated the majority of DPS technicians did not have trunk system experience. He advised there was no user training at this stage.

Chairman Felix questioned how any or all of this would have an impact on Super Bowl, specifically if Super Bowl interoperability was dependent upon the demonstration project, would any part be operational before Super Bowl, and would the White Tanks aspect be available before Super Bowl. Mr. Knight stated if White Tanks is in place, fully configured and an active part of the PRWN/TOPAZ system then it would be another level of redundancy although it is not required. He advised the "perfect" solution would be to have more subscribers/users on fewer radio systems.

Mr. Knight stated what is going on for Super Bowl for the most part is either patching systems together or deploying cache radios. He stated the initial suggestion for the demonstration project was to deploy a number of subscribers in the hands of DPS officers which would facilitate a higher or an easier level of interoperability for the Super Bowl. Commissioner Wills expressed his concern with the deployment of new technology right before Super Bowl. Chairman Felix indicated there has been a lot of talk of the PSCC demonstration project and being the Super Bowl solution to interoperability which may or may not occur.

Commissioner Aurelius questioned if the systems to be relied upon by the agencies if there would be some degree of assurance in whatever the demonstration project does that it would not bring down the backbone of the system. Mr. Knight believes that Phoenix has established a "do-nothing" date relative to system configuration, system changes, and then a start-up date after February 3. He stated we would abide by that. No other questions arose.

Statewide Conceptual Design Status

Mr. John Murray reported the Project Investment Justification (PIJ) is focused on the demonstration project. He stated it will reference scope and costing for the ultimate statewide system as part of the conceptual design. He advised the initial draft PIJ document was given to PSCC staff in mid-July and Federal Engineering (FE) is awaiting their feedback. He reported when the PIJ is returned to FE they will prepare a final version for the Government Information Technology Agency's (GITA) review and ultimately for review by the Information Technology Authorization Committee (ITAC) sometime in September.

Mr. Murray reported the Conceptual Design report was put on hold for a week to concentrate their efforts on the SCIP. He stated they are now back on track and proposed having the final draft or final document ready for the PSCC staff by the end of the month. Any considerations arising out of the writing of the SCIP will be incorporated into the Conceptual Design draft.

Mr. Murray re-emphasized the key descriptors for the defined statewide solution as being: a) Project 25 trunked, b) 700 MHz system, c) strong emphasis on partnerships with local/tribal entities rather than building new infrastructures. He reported FE is looking at 74 sites which would provide coverage to about 85% of the population. FE is also working on finalizing the financials which Mr. Murray is hoping to report on at the September PSCC meeting provided PSCC agrees with the numbers and the architecture. He indicated they are still working on final assumptions with the PSCC staff reference the ultimate/final coverage goal and the degree in which to reflect potential partnering of local/tribal entities relative to the investment amount that could be realized in terms of shared state spending. He expressed the proposed architecture will require build out of a statewide digital microwave network and the implementation plan will leverage the demonstration project as we progress forward toward the statewide system. He stated the timing of this is still undetermined based on the procurement process.

Commissioner Wills questioned the system partnering opportunities, those systems that would not be able to move, and the original agreement of the design to be Project 25 trunked, 700 MHz overlay and possess a strong, existing, high-level network for existing systems. He reminded us to not lose sight of what our original design should be and while the monies were available those issues should be addressed. He indicated many of the VHF networks that are new or under construction were not going to go away.

Mr. Murray advised the vision is to have a systems-to-systems approach with a conventional system gateway interface as part of the architecture knowing some systems may not be able to move to 700 MHz; however, PSCC still needs the ability to provide interoperability where those systems can interface with the rest of the architecture.

Commissioner Aurelius stated there was mention of having a large number of radios (mobiles and portables). He questioned if consideration was given to equipment life cycle, technology advances and the need for a plan, policy or procedure for replacement/funding of these pieces relative to life cycle or technology value. Commissioner Aurelius also expressed concern with the matching funds requirement with regard to the locals not being able to provide matching funds for the various projects they wish to participate in due to budget constraints within their

own agencies. Commissioner Wills stated governance will need to be outlined very specifically to address these issues.

Mr. Murray answered in reference to the 11,300 subscriber units this was an estimate based on previous studies research. He advised the figure was budgetary at this point and would need to be fine tuned inclusive of extras for spares, breakage or new subscribers prior to procurement. He indicated subscribers units, specifically portables, may necessitate a higher replacement cost/frequency than those at base stations. He stated this is covered in the operations section of the financials the degree that the state wants to include technology advances/system upgrades.

Chairman Felix expressed the funding upgrade towards the microwave is already allocated and he was unsure if grants monies would cover the subscriber equipment aspect of the project. He indicated the state would need to come up with a funding mechanism. He also requested as a general item for future meetings that Mr. Knight provide a quick overview to the Commission of where we are relative to our timeline in terms of milestones and conceptual design status for the overall project.

For clarification, Commissioner Morrison asked Mr. Knight if the demonstration project budget presented today if those monies were coming from the existing PSCC budget. Mr. Knight clarified monies came from the non-lapsing funds upon the creation of the Commission. She questioned if there was a need for the Commission to ratify the demonstration project expenditure. Per July meeting, she felt the vote was contingent on additional line item expenditure information being provided. Commissioner Collett stated based on the July 10, 2007 meeting minutes which read "Commissioner Morrison moved the Commission adopt the 2008/2009 budget with the caveat of being able to revisit the approved budget based on information Mr. Knight would be providing soon." Chairman Felix stated he was open to a ratification of the July 10 motion based on the additional information reference expenditure of funds toward the demonstration project funding as presented today. He questioned if more detailed information was required on what was being purchased.

After some discussion, Mr. Knight stated explanation of budget detail presented today was somewhere between a retail and final contract price. He expressed PSCC anticipated using contracts already established with the City of Phoenix and Motorola as a pass through of the dollars for the procurement of equipment. He added they expect those figures to be underneath our budget but as of yet the specifics are unknown and the Inter System Interface (ISI) and console interface are still being developed by the manufacturer.

Commissioner Morrison questioned if motion was not acted on today due to not having firm numbers and figures with regard to correct number of radios would it interfere with the process of moving the grant forward. Mr. Knight stated this was not tied to and would not interfere with the grant.

Commissioner Morrison re-emphasized the original question of "if we do not make a motion today and we wait for resolution in regards to these line items" would it slow down the process. Mr. Knight stated it would not interfere but felt this should be discussed again at the next meeting to develop the dollar amounts to the level being requested so we could move ahead. Mr.

Knight advised we should reassess the actual timeline and anticipated procurement before we initiate a purchase order for procurement or do a transfer of money. Chairman Felix asked if those numbers could be provided within 30 days and then be ratified at that point in time. Mr. Knight advised they would attempt to finalize those budget figures to arrive at what the actual contractual obligation would be for the PRWN/TOPAZ and YRCS systems by the September 25, 2007 date. He didn't feel the delay would be procurement issues but more of working through the Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) identifying all the details.

Discussion was held on the Project Investment Justification (PIJ) to be reviewed by the Government Information Technology Agency (GITA) and ultimately approved by the Information Technology Authorization Committee (ITAC) sometime in September 2007. Ms. Meyerson advised GITA's review consisted of anything over \$25,000 in state technology spending. ITAC reviews major state projects over \$1 million and the next ITAC meeting was scheduled for September 26, 2007. ITAC's purpose is to avoid the possibility of having a huge project failure when the project is of a high-risk, critical status to the state.

Mr. Knight was reminded by Ms. Lisa Maxie-Mullins our Assistant Attorney General of keeping our discussions focused on agenda-related items.

Ms. Meyerson reported the issue with the PIJ review to be done by ITAC was the pass through of money going to the City of Phoenix and the Yuma Regional Communications System. Mr. Knight stated the pass through of money was not intended to eliminate a PIJ review but to resolve the issue of ownership and operation. Mr. Knight advised with this agreement between Phoenix and Yuma we would be expanding existing systems, not building a new one. He advised the state would be providing the housing, tower structure and microwave backhaul.

Mr. Knight reported the initial "pass-through" interpretation by GITA's perspective was this did not fall under their purview; however, the PSCC Support office decided to go through with the PIJ/ITAC process for the demonstration project, and possibly in parallel with transferring monies to Phoenix and Yuma. Ms. Meyerson stated ITAC would not take this issue up as a committee if monies were spent before the committee had a chance to meet. The other option presented by Ms. Meyerson was to submit the PIJ but take out the "pass-through" monies and only submit with required state money.

Commissioner Morrison expressed the thought of a motion for approval in concept with the caveat there be no expenditure of funds until our next meeting being it was a budgeted item to first determine the effectiveness and value of the proposal and subsequent to the committee meeting then come back and approve it financially. Ms. Meyerson stated in terms of the business aspect she felt that was something the Commission could decide; however, with regard to the technology, she felt that should be under the purview of the ITAC committee.

Discussion ensued with Mr. Knight expressing concern for all the different activities taking place simultaneously and being able to give support to all of them—state plan, PSIC grant, working on budget detail, PIJ completion and preparation for ITAC. Ms. Meyerson's opinion was the demonstration project is very important in our first step toward our long-term strategy and encouraged us to bring before ITAC's review but felt on the other hand expending the money or

making commitments past the point needed for approval by ITAC to weigh in on was not wise to do and felt ITAC would not review. She felt ITAC would then only review it as an information item only without an approval or disapproval decision. Mr. Knight suggested the easy answer would be to slide the demonstration project back after the ITAC and the next PSCC meeting in September and to also re-work the demonstration project budget to obtain more precise figures of those expenditures.

Commissioner Wills questioned if ITAC meetings could be moved out to a later date. Ms. Meyerson stated these meetings occur monthly on a regular schedule 10-11 times out of the year. She advised no meetings take place if there are no actions that need to be brought to the committee. The expectation was this project would be brought before the committee for review.

Commissioner Wills inquired about ITAC's capacity to evaluate this demonstration project from a technology point of view. Ms. Meyerson advised the ITAC committee is made up of individuals who come from the corporate and government sector. They base their review from a technology position. "Does the technology make sense?" Is this the right technology to be evaluating and to be looking at and moving forward with?" She advised state projects over \$25,000 are reviewed by GITA; state projects over \$1 million are reviewed by ITAC.

Ms. Meyerson questioned the flexibility or firmness of the timeline holding to the May 31, 2008 deadline. After much discussion on keeping with or adjusting the demonstration project timeline, priority of state plan/grant process completion, PIJ completion for GITA and ITAC review/approval of demonstration project and making purchases with Phoenix and Yuma prior to those meetings, Chairman Felix suggested no action be taken at this time with further discussion/direction needed by PSCC staff and the committee working on this project with a recommended course of action to be taken for the Commission to act on. He felt the state plan and grant process were critical and should continue as scheduled but with a report on GITA/ITAC review status either staying with the original or modified schedule and also more precise figures needed for the demonstration project. It was his understanding if approval was given after ITAC review that would be our confirmation to proceed with the Phoenix and Yuma expenditures. All things considered, he felt ITAC's review of the demonstration project was a critical element which could have long-term implications on the overall state project if approval was not obtained and was reviewed only on an informational level without ITAC's endorsement. He didn't want that to be a hindrance to the overall success of the project and felt commissioners were unsure of how to proceed.

Date, Time and Location of Next Meeting

September 25, 2007, 1:00 p.m.

City of Peoria Municipal Complex (Council Chambers Building)

8401 West Monroe Street

Peoria, Arizona

Call to the Public

No comments were received.

Recommendations for Future Meetings

Meeting adjourned before recommendations for future meetings could be addressed. No comments were received.

Adjournment

Chairman Felix called for a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Wills moved to adjourn with second motion made by Commissioner Allen. Motion carried unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 3:05 pm.

APPENDIX A PSCC Demonstration Project Budget

	South Mtn	White Tanks Mtn	Oatman Mtn	Windy Pk	DPS	Total:
Microwave/Fiber	\$20,000	\$70,000	\$140,000	\$70,000		
Trunk Site Equipment		\$685,000	\$525,000			
ISI/Console Interfaces					\$285,000	
Mobile Radios					\$100,000	
Portable Radios					\$100,000	
Training					\$100,000	
	\$20,000	\$755,000	\$665,000	\$70,000	\$585,000	\$2,095,000